



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/557,069	04/21/2000	Sai V. Allavaru	5181-48300	6636

7590

03/25/2004

Robert C Kowert
Conley Rose & Tayon PC
P O Box 398
Austin, TX 78767

EXAMINER

LAO, SUE X

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2126

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

09/557,069

Applicant(s)

ALLAVARPU ET AL.

Examin r

S. Lao

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communicati n appears on the cover sheet with th correspondence address --

Peri d f r Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disp sition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 11-26 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 27-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 April 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachm nt(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5,7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-30 are pending. This action is in response to the amendment filed 12/29/2003. Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, 18, 19, 26 and 27.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 11-26 are allowed.
4. Claims 1-10 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.
5. Claims 28-30 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
6. Claims 1-10, 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites "the plurality of mapping modules" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purpose of art rejection, it is interpreted as "the plurality of plug-in mapping modules", as best understood and as it appears to be. Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1.

Claim 27 recites "the plurality of mapping modules" in lines 3-4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purpose of art rejection, it is interpreted as "the plurality of plug-in mapping modules", as best understood and as it appears to be. Further, claim 27 recites "metadata types" in line 9 and "data types" in line 17, which are inconsistent.

Claims 28-30 recite "wherein creating the one or more implementation classes as subclasses of the one or more abstract classes in the mapping framework" in lines 2-4 and 2-3, respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in these claims.

7. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foody et al (U S Pat. 5,732,270) in view of Lynch et al ("Web Enabled TMN Manager").

As to claim 27, Foody teaches a method of network management, comprising:
providing a mapping framework of one or more abstract classes (nine sub-frameworks 1-9 containing classes and subclasses);
implementing a plurality of plug-in mapping modules (frameworks and modules, fig.s 2, 5), wherein the plurality of plug-in mapping modules are each operable to provide one or more mappings (Type Description Framework) for managed object metadata/data types (fundamental data types, complex data types) between an interface definition language (OSA1, IDL) and a target object notation (OSA2), wherein the interface definition language comprises a language (C++) for defining interfaces to managed objects (object systems) across a plurality of platforms (Orbix, COM, DSOM) and across a plurality of programming languages (first, second object models, C++, C), wherein the managed objects comprise instances of the managed object data types, wherein the target object notation comprises a language for describing data (object model); and

converting managed object data types between an IDL and the second object notation (convert, col. 9, lines 13-15). See col. 7, lines 3-34; col. 10, line 63 - col. 12, line 28; col. 18, lines 37-52; col. 232, lines 29-52.

Foody does not teach that the second object notation is an abstract syntax notation which comprises a language for describing data.

Lynch teaches mapping (converter, translator) between an interface definition language IDL (CORBA IDL) and an abstract syntax notation (GDMO/ASN.1) which comprises a language for describing data (TMN-CORBA gateway). See page 123, left col.; page 124, right col. - page 125, right col..

Therefore, it would have been obvious to include an abstract syntax notation into the target object notation of Foody. The motivations to combine the teachings of Foody and Lynch include the following. Foody teaches inter-operating between incompatible systems (col. 1, line 55 - col. 2, line 11). The object systems of Lynch, CORBA and TMN/GDMO, are incompatible system (page 122, right col. - 123, left col.). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to includes the systems CORBA and TMN/GDMO of Lynch into the systems of Foody so that several alternative inter-operation solutions (page 123, left col.) are made available.

Foody teaches first data type (fundamental/complex data types) from a first set of data types (data types in first object system OSA1), corresponding second data type (fundamental/complex data types) from a second set of data types (data types in first object system OSA2), interface definition language is class independent [inherent to CORBA IDL]. The combined teaching of Foody and Lynch would have provided a mapping/converter framework to map between IDL and ASN.1, i.e., from IDL to ASN.1 and from ASN.1 to IDL. Therefore the first and the second sets of data types would have been expressed in an abstract syntax notation and in an interface definition language, respectively.

8. Applicant's arguments filed 12/29/2003 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then

Art Unit: 2126

the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sue Lao whose telephone number is (703) 305-9657. A voice mail service is also available at this number. The examiner's supervisor, SPE Meng-Ai An, can be reached on (703) 305 9678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, from 9AM to 5PM. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872 9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Sue Lao 

March 17, 2004